



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

W
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/752,273	12/29/2000	George W. Rozakis	1683-G	9130
7590	11/28/2003		EXAMINER	
Fred H. Zollinger, III SAND & SEBOLT Aston Park Professional Centre 4801 Dressler Rd., NW, Suite 194 Canton, OH 44718-3669			RAMANA, ANURADHA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3732	12
DATE MAILED: 11/28/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/752,273	ROZAKIS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Anu Ramana	3732

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 September 2002.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,2,4-6 and 24-28 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-6 and 24-28 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____ .
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ . 6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claims 1-2, 5, and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Largent (US 6,312,424).

Largent discloses a system 11 with an excimer laser 15 producing a laser beam along a beam path, a beam shaping means or beam expander 17 and a means for controlling the beam shaping means, 19, to change the curvature of the cornea for a first vision correction power or “positive diopter” in a first region and a second vision correction power or “negative diopter” in a second region wherein the regions are in appropriate circumscribing or concentric relationship (col. 1, lines 36-47 and lines 66-67, col. 2, lines 1-2, col. 3, lines 2-17 and Figure 2).

The initial statement of intended use and all other functional implications related thereto have been considered but do not appear to impose any patentably distinguishing structure over that disclosed by Largent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4, 6, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Largent.

Regarding claims 4 and 27, although Largent does not disclose the diameter of the first and second zones to be 6 mm and 4 mm, respectively, this would be an obvious design choice based on the size of the human eye since the Applicant has not disclosed that these distances provide a special advantage.

Regarding claims 6 and 28, a human eye could require a positive diopter correction equal in magnitude to the negative diopter correction since this is dependent on the structure of the particular cornea. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the claimed system for a providing a positive diopter correction equal in magnitude to the negative diopter correction since this is one selection of numerous possible values dependent on the cornea being treated.

Claims 4 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Largent in view of Warner et al. (US 4,903,695).

Largent does not specifically disclose a first zone having a diameter of 6 mm and a second zone having a diameter of 4 mm.

Warner et al. teach that the diameter of the cornea used for correction of myopia or hyperopia is in a range of 4 to 6 mm (col. 4, lines 24-32).

Accordingly it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize diameters of 6 mm and 4 mm, as taught by Warner et al., respectively, for the first zone for correction of hyperopia or “positive diopter correction” and the second zone for correction of myopia or “negative diopter correction” wherein the first zone circumscribes the second zone.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on September 10, 2003 in Paper No. 11 have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

In response to Applicants' argument that the Largent reference does not disclose “a second treatment zone that includes an area of the first treatment zone that has already been treated by means of controlling a laser or that the first zone to be treated defines the second zone to be treated,” it is noted that the law of anticipation does not require that the reference “teach” what the subject patent teaches, but rather it is only necessary that the claims under attack “read

on" something in the reference. *Kalman v. Kimberly Clark Corp.*, 218 USPQ 781 (CCPA 1983). Furthermore, the manner in which a device is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from the prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex parte Marsham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anu Ramana whose telephone number is (703) 306-4035. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday between 8:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Shaver can be reached at (703) 308-2582. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0858.

AR *Anu Radha Ramana*
November 24, 2003



EDUARDO C. ROBERT
PRIMARY EXAMINER